REMARKS:

In the Office Action mailed June 21, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-26. A response was filed on September 21, 2006. The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on October 23, 2006 indicating that the arguments presented in the September 21, 2006 do not place the application in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 8, 17, 20, 25 and 26 are amended herein. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 1-26 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,269,336 (Ladd) and U.S. Patent No. 6,801,604 (Maes).

The claimed invention selectively changes or transfers control of an input based on whether "an input corresponds to a grammar set" that is supplied by the portal (see the discussion of claims below). For example, when the input matches the grammar set, control is transferred to the portal (i.e., control including sending grammars to the recognizer, getting recognition results, and taking actions depending on the results). As such, when the portal initially passes control to the application server, the portal asks the application server to augment its grammar, such that the application server knows when control should be passed back to the portal.

Independent claim 1 as amended recites, "augmenting the speech recognition system with an augmenting grammar set supplied by a first speech recognizer of a portal" and "notifying the portal in response to an input which corresponds to the augmenting grammar set responsive to speech recognition executed via a second speech recognizer independent of the portal." Claim 1 further recites, "**transferring control to the portal and performing subsequent speech recognition at the portal**" when the input corresponds to the augmenting grammar set based on the speech recognition via the second speech recognizer. Independent claim 8 recites similar features.

Independent claim 17 recites, "connecting a call to a portal having a first speech recognizer", "requesting services of a remote application server having a second speech recognizer via the call" and "transmitting an augmenting grammar set of the first speech recognizer from the portal to the remote application server." Claim 17 further recites, "connecting the call to and **transferring control of the call to the remote application server**", "breaking the connection between the call and the portal" and "notifying the portal when an input

during the call corresponds to the augmenting grammar set in accordance with speech recognition executed via the second speech recognizer and **transferring control of the call back to the portal** and performing subsequent speech recognition at the portal" (emphasis added).

Claim 20 recites, "notifying the portal in response to an input which corresponds to the augmenting grammar set responsive to speech recognition executed via a second speech recognizer independent of the portal" and "**transferring control** of the speech recognition to the portal **when said input corresponds to the augmenting grammar set**" (emphasis added).

Claim 25 also recites, "**switching control** of a call **from the application server to the portal** responsive to detection of an input corresponding to the grammar set via the second speech recognizer of the application server, and performing subsequent speech recognition at the portal" (emphasis added).

Independent claim 26 recites transferring "a grammar set of a portal to an application server and subsequently transferring control of the call to the application server" and "**returning control of the call back to the portal subsequent to determining that said input corresponds to the transferred grammar set** based on the speech recognition by the application server and performing subsequent speech recognition at the portal" (emphasis added).

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Ladd does not explicitly teach the execution of the speech recognition outside of the portal. Instead, a user in Ladd accesses services from the information sources through voice recognition at the electronic network, referred to as the portal by the Examiner, where control of the speech recognition is always at the electronic network.

In particular, the automatic speech recognition (ASR) unit of Ladd processes each speech input from users to determine whether a speech pattern matches grammars/vocabulary stored in the database (see, col. 9, lines 26-38). That is, all speech inputs (calls) from users in Ladd are handled or controlled by the electronic network, and thus, Ladd is limited to speech recognition only via the ASR unit (i.e., requiring added interaction with an application server).

The Examiner relies on Maes as teaching execution of the speech recognition outside of the portal. In Maes, when a call comes in, an application server is identified from one of possibly a number distributed throughout the network and an audio is shipped to a recognition server, either at the same location as the application server, or at a different location. However, the application maintains control (see e.g. the "control" lines in Figs. 5, 6, and 7).

Ladd and Maes, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed invention including "notifying the portal" when "an input corresponds to the augmenting grammar set responsive to speech recognition executed via a second speech recognizer independent of the portal" and "thereby transferring control to the portal and performing subsequent speech recognition at the portal", as recited in claims 1 and 8.

Specifically, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Ladd does not teach speech recognition outside of the portal and Maes does not teach or suggest the claimed "transferring control to the portal and performing subsequent speech recognition at the portal" when the input "corresponds to the augmenting grammar set", as recited in claims 1 and 8.

Maes, at best, uses outside speech processing for performance reasons and does not teach transfer of control to the portal when the input matches the grammar set supplied by the portal as taught by the invention.

Similarly, the combination of Ladd and Maes does not teach or suggest initially "connecting a call to a portal", "breaking the connection between the call and the portal", "connecting the call to and transferring control of the call to the remote application server" where control of the call is "transferred back" to the portal for performing subsequent speech recognition at the portal when "an input during the call corresponds to the augmenting grammar set", as recited in claim 17.

Moreover, Ladd and Maes do not teach or suggest "transferring control of the speech recognition to the portal when said input corresponds to the grammar set" (claim 20), "switching control of a call from the application server to the portal... and performing subsequent speech recognition at the portal" (claim 25) and "returning control of the call back to the portal subsequent to determining that said input corresponds to the transferred grammar set based on the speech recognition by the application server (claim 26).

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Ladd and Maes.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Ladd and Maes. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, claim 10 recites, "wherein when a caller requests access to the application server, the voice gateway connects the call to the application server and breaks the connection between the call and the portal."

As mentioned above, Ladd is limited to voice recognition only at the electronic network and Maes only distributes an input when the input requires complex speech recognition.

Ladd and Maes, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest selective switch of control over speech recognition between speech recognizers where "when a caller requests access to the application server, the voice gateway connects the call to the application server and breaks the connection between the call and the portal", as recited in claim 10.

On page 2 of the Advisory Action mailed October 23, 2006 and page 3 of the Office Action mailed June 21, 2006, the Examiner indicated that Maes provides the motivation to modify the teachings of Ladd with remote speech processing because it would be advantageous to shift more intense speech processing to adequately prepared systems Maes at col. 24, line 55 through col. 25, line 46. Ladd is directed to central processing all speech inputs from users via the ASR unit to provide access to various types of information from information sources (see, col. 3, lines 24-39 and col. 9, lines 26-38).

The proposed shifting of intense speech processing of Maes would render the Ladd system unsatisfactory for the centralized speech recognition at the electronic network (portal) in Ladd.

In light of the above, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/21/2006

By: Temnit Afework

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202